arXiv:1608.01614v1 [math.CO] 4 Aug 2016

DETECTING THE INTEGER DECOMPOSITION PROPERTY AND EHRHART UNIMODALITY IN REFLEXIVE SIMPLICES

BENJAMIN BRAUN, ROBERT DAVIS, AND LIAM SOLUS

Abstract. The Ehrhart series of a lattice polytope P is a rational function encoding the number of lattice points in nonnegative integer scalings of P. The numerator of this series is the (Ehrhart) h^*-polynomial of P. An active topic of research is to characterize those polytopes for which the distribution of the coefficients of the h^*-polynomial is unimodal. It was originally conjectured that all reflexive polytopes have unimodal h^*-polynomials. However, counterexamples to this conjecture were found in the form of simplices. A weaker, and currently wide-open, conjecture claims that all Gorenstein polytopes with the integer decomposition property (IDP) have unimodal h^*-polynomials. Based on the counterexamples to the original conjecture, it is worthwhile to investigate the validity of the open conjecture in the special case of reflexive simplices. The collection of reflexive simplices admits a classification in terms of arithmetic sequences. In this paper, we use this arithmetic classification to recast the open conjecture in the language of number theory. We first provide a number theoretic characterization of the h^*-polynomials and IDP for a subfamily of reflexive simplices. We then develop a systematic framework by which to study this problem and validate the conjecture for families of reflexive simplices within this setting. Evenmore, we see there exist simplices within these families that meet only a necessary (but not sufficient) condition for IDP that also have unimodal h^*-polynomials.

1. Introduction

Two well-studied properties of the coefficients of polynomials with non-negative integer coefficients are *symmetry* and *unimodality*.

(1) A polynomial $a_0 + a_1 z + \cdots + a_d z^d$ with $a_d \neq 0$ is called *symmetric* if $a_i = a_{d-i}$ for all $i \in [d]$.
(2) A polynomial $a_0 + a_1 z + \cdots + a_d z^d$ with $a_d \neq 0$ is called *unimodal* if there exists an index j such that $a_i \leq a_{i+1}$ for all $i < j$ and $a_i \geq a_{i+1}$ for all $i \geq j$.

1.1. **The Algebraic Context.** Given a finitely generated $\mathbb{C}$-algebra $A = \oplus_{i=0}^{\infty} A_i$, we say A is *standard* if A is generated by A_1 and *semistandard* if A is integral over the subalgebra generated by A_1. Recall that the Hilbert series of a graded algebra A is the generating function

$$H(A; z) := \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(A_i) z^i = \frac{\sum_j h_j z^j}{(1-z)^{\dim(A)}}.$$

The polynomial $h(A; z) := \sum_j h_j z^j$ is called the h-polynomial of A. When A is Cohen-Macaulay, each $h_j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

An active topic of research is developing combinatorial interpretations of the h-polynomial coefficients and their distribution. It is known that the h-polynomial of A is symmetric when A is Gorenstein, but the unimodality property is more subtle. A long-standing open problem is the following conjecture due to Stanley [14, Conjecture 4(a)], also appearing in Hibi [9, Conjecture 1.5].

Conjecture 1.1 (Stanley, [14])**.** For A a standard graded Gorenstein integral domain, $h(A; z)$ is unimodal.

Stanley's original conjecture was that standard graded Cohen-Macaulay integral domains have unimodal h-vectors, but this is false in general [5, Section 5].

Date: 3 August 2016.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 52B20, 05E40, 05A20, 05A15.
The first author was partially supported by grant H98230-16-1-0045 from the U.S. National Security Agency.

1.2. **The Discrete Geometric Context.** A subset $P \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a d-dimensional *convex lattice polytope* if P arises as the convex hull of finitely many points in $\mathbb{Z}^n$ that together span an affine d-flat in $\mathbb{R}^n$. The *Ehrhart function* of P is the lattice point enumerator $i(P;t) := |tP \cap \mathbb{Z}^n|$, where $tP := \{tp : p \in P\}$ denotes the t^{th} dilate of the polytope P. It is well-known [8] that $i(P;t)$ is a polynomial in t of degree d, and the corresponding *Ehrhart series* of P is the rational function

$$\mathrm{Ehr}_P(z) := \sum_{t\geq 0} i(P;t)z^t = \frac{h_0^* + h_1^* z + \cdots + h_d^* z^d}{(1-z)^{d+1}},$$

where the coefficients $h_0^*, h_1^*, \ldots, h_d^*$ are all nonnegative integers [13]. The polynomial $h^*(P;z) := h_0^* + h_1^* z + \cdots + h_d^* z^d$ is called the *(Ehrhart) h^*-polynomial* of P. Analogously, the coefficient vector $h^*(P) := (h_0^*, h_1^*, \ldots, h_d^*)$ is called the *(Ehrhart) h^*-vector* of P. We will often say P is *h^*-unimodal* whenever $h^*(P;z)$ is unimodal. Since $h^*(P;z)$ arises via the enumeration of combinatorial data and has only nonnegative integer coefficients, researchers have studied combinatorial interpretations of the h^*-coefficients and their distribution. A current challenge in Ehrhart theory is to understand the geometric properties of a polytope that are necessary and/or sufficient for $h^*(P;z)$ to be symmetric and/or unimodal [3].

While Ehrhart series arise from a combinatorial context in polyhedral geometry, there is a well-known connection to commutative algebra. The *cone over* P is

$$\mathrm{cone}\,(P) := \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}\{(1,p) : p \in P\} \subset \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$$

where we consider the new variable to be indexed at 0, i.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^n = \mathbb{R}^{1+n}$ is written $x = (x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. Given a lattice polytope P in $\mathbb{R}^n$, the *semigroup algebra associated to* P is $\mathbb{C}[P] := \mathbb{C}[x^v : v \in \mathrm{cone}\,(P) \cap \mathbb{Z}^{1+n}]$. We grade $C[P]$ by $\deg(x_0^{m_0}\cdots x_n^{m_n}) = m_0$. With this grading, $\mathbb{C}[P]$ is a semistandard semigroup algebra, where the algebra generated by $\mathbb{C}[P]_1$ is $\mathbb{C}[x^v : v \in (1,P) \cap \mathbb{Z}^{1+n}]$, i.e. the semigroup algebra generated by integer points in $(1,P)$. Given this, Conjecture 1.1 manifests itself in the setting of polytopes that have symmetric h^*-polynomials and the integer decomposition property, defined as follows.

Definition 1.2. A polytope P has the *integer decomposition property*, or is IDP, if for every positive integer m and each $x \in mP \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$, there exist m points $x_1, \ldots, x_m \in P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ for which $x = \sum x_i$.

It is straightforward to verify that a lattice polytope P is IDP if and only if $\mathbb{C}[P]$ is standard. Regarding symmetry, a lattice polytope $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ containing 0 in its interior is called *reflexive* if its polar $P^* := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x^T y \leq 1 \text{ for all } x \in P\}$ is also a lattice polytope. In [10], it is shown that a lattice polytope $P \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is reflexive if and only if P is full-dimensional (i.e. $d = n$), the origin is in its interior, and $h^*(P;z)$ is symmetric. Reflexive polytopes are a special case of the full-dimensional polytopes $P \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ for which $h^*(P;z)$ is symmetric, known as Gorenstein polytopes. In this setting, Conjecture 1.1 translates to the following statement, first posed by Hibi and Ohsugi [11].

Conjecture 1.3 (Hibi and Ohsugi, [11])**.** If P is Gorenstein and IDP, then $h^*(P;z)$ is unimodal.

As in the more general case of graded Cohen-Macaulay algebras, unimodality of $h^*(P;z)$ has proven to be a more elusive property to characterize than symmetry when using only the geometry of P. Since the symmetry property of $h^*(P;z)$ reduces the number of inequalities to be verified by one-half, there has been much research into when $h^*(P;z)$ is both symmetric and unimodal [3]. It was shown by Payne [12] that there exist reflexive simplices whose h^*-polynomials are not unimodal. Thus in the symmetric h^*-polynomial case some additional hypothesis is required, be it IDP or something else.

1.3. **Our Contribution.** In this paper we consider the case of Conjecture 1.3 as it applies to reflexive IDP lattice simplices. Since the examples of Gorenstein polytopes with nonunimodal h^*-polynomials found by Payne [12] are reflexive simplices, it is worthwhile to investigate this special case of the conjecture. In [7] Conrads provides an arithmetic classification of reflexive lattice simplices that can be used to this end. In this article, we use Conrads' classification to recast Conjecture 1.3 in the language of arithmetic number theory, and then validate the conjecture for certain families of reflexive simplices.

The remainder of this paper is outlined as follows. In section 2, we provide a number theoretic characterization of the h^*-polynomial (Theorem 2.5) and of the integer decomposition property (Theorem 2.6) for a collection of reflexive simplices that serve as generators within Conrads' classification. We then establish a systematic framework by which to study this collection of reflexive simplices (section 3), and we provide a necessary (but not sufficient) condition for a reflexive simplex to be IDP within this framework (Lemma 3.3).

In this setting, we verify that Conjecture 1.3 holds for some families of reflexive simplices (sections 4 and 5). Amongst these examples, we find reflexive simplices meeting only the strictly weaker condition of Lemma 3.3 that both satisfy and fail to satisfy h^*-unimodality (Remark 5.6). On the other hand, the cases of Lemma 3.3 capturing non-h^*-unimodal examples are precisely those cases that also contain non-IDP simplices (Table 2). The results of this paper set the stage for a detailed investigation of Conjecture 1.3 in the special case of reflexive lattice simplices from a number theoretic perspective. In section 6 we outline directions for future work based on these results.

2. IDP and Ehrhart Theory for the Reflexive Simplices $\Delta_{(1,q)}$

2.1. **Background.** Given a polytope $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ with vertices $v_0, \ldots, v_k$, the *height* of a point $x \in \text{cone}\,(P)$ is its first coordinate x_0. If P is a lattice simplex with vertices $v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_n$, the *fundamental parallelepiped* of $\text{cone}\,(P)$ is

$$\Pi_P := \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{n} \lambda_i (1, v_i) \ : \ 0 \leq \lambda_i < 1 \right\}.$$

The fundamental parallelepiped tiles $\text{cone}\,(P)$ through non-negative integer combinations of $\{(1, v_i)\}_{i=0}^n$, yielding the following well-known lemma.

Lemma 2.1. If P is a lattice simplex, then

$$h^*(P; z) = \sum_{m \in \Pi_P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n} z^{m_0}.$$

Thus, the coefficients of the h^*-polynomial of a lattice simplex record how many elements of Π_P have a given first coordinate. Further, every element of Π_P can be written as a sum of elements from $(1, P) \cap \mathbb{Z}^{1+n}$ if and only if P is IDP.

In [7] Conrads provides an algorithm to classify all reflexive simplices, associating to each such simplex a vector referred to as its "type". A subset of the reflexive simplices is obtained through the following construction. Let $q = (q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_n)$ be an nondecreasing sequence of positive integers satisfying the condition

$$q_j \mid (1 + \sum_{i \neq j} q_i)$$

for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$. For such a vector, the simplex

$$\Delta_{(1,q)} := \text{conv} \left\{ e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_n, -\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i e_i \right\}$$

where $e_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the i-th standard basis vector, is reflexive. When the q-vector is understood, we will often label the vertices of $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ as $v_i := e_i$ and $v_0 := -\sum_{i=1}^n q_i e_i$. It is straightforward to check that for a simplex whose vertex set contains the standard basis vectors, the polarity criteria for reflexivity forces the above divisibility condition on the final vertex. While the collection of all such $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ does not encompass all reflexive simplices, the rest can be obtained through polarity and applications of certain Hermitian operators on the $\Delta_{(1,q)}$. Thus, these simplices can be thought of as generators under Conrads' classification.

When considering unimodality problems for reflexive simplices, we will see that the *affine free sum* operation $\Delta_{(1,p)} *_0 \Delta_{(1,q)}$ defined in [4] plays an important role. We now recall this definition.

Definition 2.2. Let $P, Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be two lattice polytopes. We say that $P \oplus Q := \text{conv}\,\{P \cup Q\}$ is an *affine free sum* if, up to unimodular equivalence, $P \cap Q = \{0\}$ and the affine span of P and Q are orthogonal coordinate subspaces of $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Suppose further that $P \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ are reflexive polytopes with $0 \in P$ and the vertices of Q labeled as $v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_m$. For every $i = 0, 1, \ldots, m$, we define the polytope

$$P *_i Q := \text{conv}\,\{(P \times 0^m) \cup (0^n \times Q - v_i)\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+m}.$$

The following result of [4] relates affine free sums to h^*-unimodality for IDP polytopes $\Delta_{(1,p)} *_0 \Delta_{(1,q)}$. It will be useful when we prove h^*-unimodality for certain families of reflexive simplices in sections 4 and 5.

Theorem 2.3 (Braun & Davis [4])**.** If $\Delta_{(1,p)}$ and $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ are full-dimensional reflexive simplices with $p = (p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ and $q = (q_1, \ldots, q_m)$, respectively, then $\Delta_{(1,p)} *_0 \Delta_{(1,q)}$ is a reflexive simplex $\Delta_{(1,y)}$ with $y = (p_1, \ldots, p_n, sq_1, \ldots, sq_m)$ where $s = \sum_{j=0}^{n} p_j$. If $\Delta_{(1,y)}$ arises in this form, then it decomposes as a free sum. Further, if $\Delta_{(1,p)}$ and $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ are reflexive, IDP and h^*-unimodal, then so is $\Delta_{(1,p)} *_0 \Delta_{(1,q)}$.

2.2. **The h^*-polynomials for $\Delta_{(1,q)}$.** In this subsection, we establish basic properties of $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ with respect to h^*-polynomials.

Proposition 2.4. The number of lattice points in $\Pi_{\Delta_{(1,q)}}$ is $1 + q_1 + \cdots + q_n$.

Proof. Recall [2, Lemma 9.2] that the number of lattice points under consideration is given by the absolute value of

$$d(q_1, \ldots, q_n) := \det \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -q_1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -q_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & -q_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & -q_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

To set up induction, assume that $d(q_1, \ldots, q_k) = (-1)^{k-1}(1 + q_1 + \cdots + q_k)$ for all $k \leq n-1$, which is straightforward to verify for small values of k. Expanding the determinant down the first column and applying the inductive hypothesis,

$$d(q_1, \ldots, q_n) = (-1)^{n-2}(-q_1) - (-1)^{n-2}(1 + q_2 + \cdots + q_n) = (-1)^{n-1}(1 + q_1 + \cdots + q_n),$$

which completes the proof. □

This proposition quickly leads us to our first result.

Theorem 2.5. The h^*-polynomial of $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ is

$$h^*(\Delta_{(1,q)}; z) = \sum_{b=0}^{q_1+\cdots+q_n} z^{w(b)}$$

where

$$w(b) := b - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\lfloor \frac{q_i b}{1 + q_1 + \cdots + q_n} \right\rfloor.$$

Proof. Let $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n, v_0$ denote the columns of

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -q_1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -q_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & -q_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & -q_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

By Proposition 2.4 and Cramer's rule, every point in $\Pi_{\Delta_{(1,q)}}$ is of the form

$$p := \sum_{i=0}^{n} \lambda_i (1, v_i)$$

where $0 \leq \lambda_i < 1$ for all i and $\lambda_i = \frac{b_i}{1+q_1+\cdots+q_n}$ for some $b_i = 0, 1, \ldots, q_1 + \cdots + q_n$. If $p \in \mathbb{Z}^{1+n}$, then it must follow that for $i \geq 1$

$$\lambda_i = q_i \lambda_0 - \lfloor q_i \lambda_0 \rfloor.$$

Hence, the choice of λ_0 determines the point p, and we write

$$\lambda_0 := \frac{b}{1 + q_1 + \cdots + q_n}.$$

The height of the point corresponding to a given value of b is the first coordinate, which is easily computed to be

$$b - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\lfloor \frac{q_i b}{1 + q_1 + \cdots + q_n} \right\rfloor .$$

Applying Lemma 2.1 completes the proof. □

2.3. **The Integer Decomposition Property and $\Delta_{(1,q)}$.** The following result translates the IDP property into a number-theoretic setting. Our main tool for investigating $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ is given by Corollary 2.7 below, a necessary but not sufficient condition to detect the IDP property.

Theorem 2.6. The reflexive simplex $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ is IDP if and only if for every $j = 1, \ldots, n$, for all $b = 0, 1, \ldots, q_j - 1$ satisfying

$$b\left(\frac{1 + \sum_{i \neq j} q_i}{q_j}\right) - \sum_{i \neq j} \left\lfloor \frac{bq_i}{q_j} \right\rfloor \geq 2 \tag{1}$$

there exists a positive integer $c < b$ satisfying the following equations, where the first is considered for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ with $i \neq j$:

$$\left\lfloor \frac{bq_i}{q_j} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{cq_i}{q_j} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{(b-c)q_i}{q_j} \right\rfloor , \text{ and} \tag{2}$$

$$c\left(\frac{1 + \sum_{i \neq j} q_i}{q_j}\right) - \sum_{i \neq j} \left\lfloor \frac{cq_i}{q_j} \right\rfloor = 1. \tag{3}$$

Proof. Recall that the IDP property for a lattice simplex P is equivalent to the property that every lattice point in Π_P arises as a sum of lattice points in $(1, P)$. Let $g \in \Pi_{\Delta_{(1,q)}}$. Since $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ is reflexive, we may subtract $(1, 0, 0, \ldots, 0)$ from g until we reach a lattice point p on the boundary of cone $\left(\Delta_{(1,q)}\right)$. This point p must lie in the fundamental parallelepiped for a face of $\Delta_{(1,q)}$, hence $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ is IDP if and only if every facet of $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ is IDP.

Observe that the facet with vertices $\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}$ is unimodular, hence it is IDP. The remaining facets are of the form

$$F_j := \operatorname{conv}\left\{ e_1, \ldots, e_{j-1}, e_{j+1}, \ldots, e_n, -\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i e_i \right\}$$

for $j = 1, \ldots, n$. Thus we are looking for necessary and sufficient conditions for F_j to be IDP. For $i \in [n] \setminus \{j\}$, set $v_i := e_i$, and set $v_0 := -\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i e_i$. Every lattice point in Π_{F_j} is of the form

$$r = \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq n \\ i \neq j}} \lambda_i v_i \, .$$

Since the vector $(1, e_j)$ is not a summand for r, and since r is an integer point, $\lambda_0 \cdot (-q_j)$ must be an integer. Hence,

$$\lambda_0 = b/q_j$$

for some b in $\{0, 1, 2, \ldots, q_j - 1\}$. Note that if $b = 0$, r is in the fundamental parallelepiped for the facet with vertices $\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}$, and hence equal to the zero vector.

We next show that for every choice of b between 1 and $q_j - 1$, setting $\lambda_0 = b/q_j$ yields a unique lattice point of Π_{F_j}. Since every entry of r is integral and $0 \leq \lambda_i < 1$, it follows that

$$\lambda_i = \frac{bq_i}{q_j} - \left\lfloor \frac{bq_i}{q_j} \right\rfloor .$$

Thus, as in the proof of Theorem 2.5, the value of λ_0 determines the remaining λ_i's. When $\lambda_0 = b/q_j$, the height of the resulting point is

$$\frac{b}{q_j} + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq n \\ i \neq j}} \left(\frac{bq_i}{q_j} - \left\lfloor \frac{bq_i}{q_j} \right\rfloor \right) ,$$

which is an integer if and only if

$$\frac{b}{q_j} + \sum_{\substack{1\leq i\leq n\\ i\neq j}} \frac{bq_i}{q_j} = b\left(\frac{1+\sum_{\substack{1\leq i\leq n\\ i\neq j}} q_i}{q_j}\right)$$

is an integer. Since $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ is reflexive, we know that q_j divides $1+\sum_{\substack{0\leq i\leq n\\ i\neq j}} q_i$, and thus this height is an integer. Hence, for every choice of b above, r is a lattice point given by

$$r = r_b := \begin{bmatrix} b\left(\frac{1+\sum_{i\neq j} q_i}{q_j}\right) - \sum_{i\neq j}\left(\left\lfloor \frac{bq_i}{q_j}\right\rfloor\right) \\ -\left\lfloor \frac{bq_1}{q_j}\right\rfloor \\ \vdots \\ -\left\lfloor \frac{bq_{j-1}}{q_j}\right\rfloor \\ -b \\ -\left\lfloor \frac{bq_{j+1}}{q_j}\right\rfloor \\ \vdots \\ -\left\lfloor \frac{bq_n}{q_j}\right\rfloor \end{bmatrix}.$$

The simplex F_j is IDP if and only if for every r_b at height greater than or equal to two, there exists an $r_c \in \Pi_{F_j}$ at height one and an $r_d \in \Pi_{F_j}$ such that

$$r_b - r_c = r_d\,.$$

Given b and considering this vector equation entry-by-entry, this is equivalent to solving the following system with integers c and d between 1 and $q_j - 1$:

$$-1 + \left(b\left(\frac{1+\sum_{i\neq j} q_i}{q_j}\right) - \sum_{i\neq j}\left\lfloor \frac{bq_i}{q_j}\right\rfloor\right) = d\left(\frac{1+\sum_{i\neq j} q_i}{q_j}\right) - \sum_{i\neq j}\left\lfloor \frac{dq_i}{q_j}\right\rfloor \tag{4}$$

$$\left\lfloor \frac{bq_i}{q_j}\right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{cq_i}{q_j}\right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{dq_i}{q_j}\right\rfloor, i\neq j \tag{5}$$

$$c\left(\frac{1+\sum_{i\neq j} q_i}{q_j}\right) - \sum_{i\neq j}\left\lfloor \frac{cq_i}{q_j}\right\rfloor = 1 \tag{6}$$

Substituting (6) for the "1" on the left-hand side of (4), and substituting (5) for each of the "$\left\lfloor \frac{dq_i}{q_j}\right\rfloor$" on the right-hand side of (4), yields $b - c = d$. Thus, we can reduce this system of equations to an equivalent system of equations:

$$\left\lfloor \frac{bq_i}{q_j}\right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{cq_i}{q_j}\right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{(b-c)q_i}{q_j}\right\rfloor, i\neq j \tag{7}$$

$$c\left(\frac{1+\sum_{i\neq j} q_i}{q_j}\right) - \sum_{i\neq j}\left\lfloor \frac{cq_i}{q_j}\right\rfloor = 1 \tag{8}$$

Hence, $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ is IDP if and only if each of its facets is IDP, which occurs if and only if for every $j = 1,\ldots,n$, for all $b = 1,\ldots,q_j - 1$ corresponding to a lattice point at height at least two there exists a positive integer c solving (7) and (8). □

At this point, we will frequently write $\left\{\frac{a}{b}\right\}$ to denote the fractional part of a/b.

Corollary 2.7. Let $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ be reflexive. If $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ is IDP then for all $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$

$$\frac{1}{q_j} + \sum_{i \neq j} \left\{ \frac{q_i}{q_j} \right\} = 1.$$

For any vector q of increasing positive integers that satisfies these equations for all $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, the simplex $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ is reflexive. However, this condition is necessary but not sufficient for $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ to be IDP.

Proof. By Theorem 2.6, $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ is IDP if for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$ we have that for all $b = 0, 1, \ldots, q_j - 1$ satisfying equation (1) there exists $0 < c < b$ satisfying equations (2) and (3). Therefore, if $b = 1$ satisfies (1) then trivially no such c exists, meaning $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ cannot be IDP. Thus, whenever $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ is IDP, $b = 1$ must not satisfy (1). Moreover, since the left-hand side of (1) is equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{q_j} + \sum_{i \neq j} \left\{ \frac{q_i}{q_j} \right\}$$

and $q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_n > 0$ then if (1) is not satisfied for $b = 1$ it must be that

$$\frac{1}{q_j} + \sum_{i \neq j} \left\{ \frac{q_i}{q_j} \right\} = 1\,.$$

To see that these equations imply reflexivity of $\Delta_{(1,q)}$, note that the j-th equation verifies that the divisibility condition $q_j \mid (1 + \sum_{i \neq j} q_i)$ holds. As this holds for all j, we conclude that $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ is reflexive.

Finally, to show that this condition is not sufficient to establish IDP, consider the vector $q = (2, 2, 15, 20, 20)$. Using the technique from the proof of Theorem 2.5, one can compute that the lattice points in $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ are the columns of the following matrix.

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -15 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & -2 & -3 & -7 & -8 & -9 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -20 & 0 & -1 & -1 & -2 & -3 & -4 & -10 & -11 & -12 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -20 & 0 & -1 & -1 & -2 & -3 & -4 & -10 & -11 & -12 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Further, the point

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -15 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -20 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -20 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1/15 \\ 1/15 \\ 0 \\ 2/3 \\ 2/3 \\ 8/15 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ -1 \\ -8 \\ -10 \\ -10 \end{bmatrix} \in 2\Delta_{(1,2,2,15,20,20)}\,.$$

It is straightforward to verify that this point is not the sum of exactly two lattice points in $\Delta_{(1,2,2,15,20,20)}$, and thus this simplex is not IDP. However, $(2, 2, 15, 20, 20)$ satisfies our linear system. □

Remark 2.8. An equivalent formulation of Corollary 2.7 is that if q corresponds to a reflexive IDP simplex, then for each $j = 1, \ldots, n$ the sum

$$1 + \sum_{i \neq j} (q_i \bmod q_j)$$

must be equal to q_j. In order for the reflexive condition to be satisfied, this sum must be equal to a multiple of q_j. Thus, this necessary condition for IDP reflexive is a strengthening of the divisibility condition characterizing reflexivity.

Remark 2.9. Corollary 2.7 implies that for $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ IDP and $b = 2, 3, \ldots, q_j - 1$ the choice of $c = 1$ is always a potential solution to (2), as it satisfies equation (3).

Example 2.10. Given $r \geq 0$, $s \geq 3$, and $k \geq r+2$, Payne [12] obtained many non-IDP reflexive simplices with non-unimodal h^*-vectors. His construction used a different lattice than $\mathbb{Z}^n$, but is equivalent to constructing the simplices $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ for

$$(q_1, \ldots, q_n) = (\underbrace{1, 1, \ldots, 1}_{sk-1 \text{ times}}, \underbrace{s, s, \ldots, s}_{r+1 \text{ times}})\,.$$

Using Theorem 2.5, we see that

$$h^*(\Delta_{(1,q)};z) = \sum_{b=0}^{s(k+r+1)-1} z^{b-(r+1)\lfloor sb/s(k+r+1)\rfloor}$$

from which it is straightforward to compute that

$$h^*(\Delta_{(1,q)};z) = (1+z^k+z^{2k}+\cdots+z^{(s-1)k})(1+z+z^2+\cdots+z^{k+r})\,.$$

Non-unimodality for most of these simplices follows immediately from the conditions on r, b, and s. One can verify that $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ is not IDP using the property that $h_1^* = 1$, hence the only lattice points in $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ are the vertices and the unique interior point of $\Delta_{(1,q)}$, hence the vector $(1,0,0,\ldots,0)$ is the only vector in $\Pi_{\Delta_{(1,q)}}$ at height 1. This prevents the existence of the "c" value required in Theorem 2.6.

Example 2.11. Let $d \geq 3$ and set $q = (d, \underbrace{d+1,\ldots,d+1}_{d-1 \text{ times}})$. Using Theorem 2.5 one can derive

$$h^*(\Delta_{(1,q)};z) = 1+(d+2)z+(d+2)z^2+\cdots+(d+2)z^{d-1}+z^d\,.$$

That these polytopes are IDP and h^*-unimodal was established using ad hoc methods in [4], where they were studied due to their interesting properties with respect to weak Lefschetz elements. In the current work, these polytopes fall within the more general family discussed in Section 4.

3. q-Vectors With Fixed Support

Our goal in this section is to establish a systematic framework through which to investigate $\Delta_{(1,q)}$. Given positive integers $r_1 < r_2 < \cdots < r_k$, write

$$(r_1^{x_1}, r_2^{x_2}, \ldots, r_k^{x_k}) := (\underbrace{r_1, r_1, \ldots, r_1}_{x_1 \text{ times}}, \underbrace{r_2, r_2, \ldots, r_2}_{x_2 \text{ times}}, \ldots, \underbrace{r_k, r_k, \ldots, r_k}_{x_k \text{ times}}).$$

Definition 3.1. Say that both q and $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ are *supported* by the vector $r = (r_1,\ldots,r_k)$ if there exist positive integers $r_1 < r_2 < \cdots < r_k$ and $x_1,\ldots,x_k$ such that

$$q = (q_1,\ldots,q_n) = (r_1^{x_1}, r_2^{x_2}, \ldots, r_k^{x_k}).$$

An *r-vector* is any vector of positive integers $r = (r_1,\ldots,r_k)$ in which $r_1 < r_2 < \cdots < r_k$.

Theorem 3.2. Fix an r-vector $r = (r_1,\ldots,r_k)$ with $\gcd(r_1,\ldots,r_k) = 1$. There are infinitely many reflexive $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ supported by r.

Proof. By the positive solution to the Frobenius coin exchange problem [2, Chapter 1], there exists a positive integer M such that for all $m \geq M$, there exist positive integers $x_1,\ldots,x_k$ such that $m = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^k x_i r_i$. Thus, there exists a positive integer L such that for all $\ell \geq L$, there exist positive integers $x_1,\ldots,x_k$ such that $\ell\,\mathrm{lcm}(r_1,\ldots,r_k) = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^k x_i r_i$. For any such ℓ, for all $i = 1,\ldots,k$ we have that

$$r_i \;\mid\; \ell\,\mathrm{lcm}(r_1,\ldots,r_k) = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^k x_j r_j\,.$$

Hence, there are infinitely many $q = (r_1^{x_1}, r_2^{x_2}, \ldots, r_k^{x_k})$ such that the divisibility condition for reflexivity of $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ is satisfied. □

The following lemma is equivalent to Corollary 2.7.

Lemma 3.3. If the r-vector $r = (r_1,\ldots,r_k)$ supports a reflexive IDP simplex $\Delta_{(1,q)}$, then there exists a vector of positive integers $x = (x_1,\ldots,x_k)$ satisfying the $k \times k$ system of linear equations $Rx = b$ where

$$b_i := r_i - 1$$

and

$$R_{j,i} := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i = j \\ r_i & \text{if } i < j \\ r_i \bmod r_j & \text{if } i > j \end{cases}.$$

If a solution to this system of equations consisting of positive integers exists, then it corresponds to a reflexive $\Delta_{(1,q)}$. However, this condition is necessary but not sufficient to establish IDP.

Proof. This lemma is a restatement of Corollary 2.7 using the notation $(r_1^{x_1}, r_2^{x_2}, \ldots, r_k^{x_k})$. □

Consider an r-vector $r = (r_1, \ldots, r_k)$. The following theorem and its corollary capture the fact that the IDP reflexive simplices detected by the divisibility pattern $r_i \mid r_k$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, k-1$ arise as free sums of IDP reflexive simplices of smaller dimension. Since h^*-unimodality for these simplices is captured by Theorem 2.3, we see that a fundamental source of previously unstudied IDP reflexive simplices are those $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ with supporting r-vectors in which $r_i \nmid r_k$ for some $i \in [k-1]$.

Theorem 3.4. Fix an r-vector $r = (r_1, \ldots, r_k)$ for which $r_i \mid r_k$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\}$. If $q = (r_1^{x_1}, \ldots, r_k^{x_k})$ corresponds to a reflexive IDP simplex, then $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ is an affine free sum of the simplices defined by the q-vectors $(r_1^{x_1}, \ldots, r_{k-1}^{x_{k-1}})$ and (1^{x_k}).

Proof. Using the notation of Lemma 3.3, observe that after canceling denominators in $Rx = b$ our matrix equation has the form

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccccc|c} 0 & r_2 \bmod r_1 & r_3 \bmod r_1 & \cdots & r_{k-1} \bmod r_1 & 0 \\ r_1 & 0 & r_3 \bmod r_2 & \cdots & r_{k-1} \bmod r_2 & \vdots \\ r_1 & r_2 & 0 & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ r_1 & r_2 & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & r_{k-1} \bmod r_{k-2} & \vdots \\ r_1 & r_2 & r_3 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \hline r_1 & r_2 & r_3 & \cdots & r_{k-1} & 0 \end{array}\right] \left[\begin{array}{c} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \\ \vdots \\ x_k \end{array}\right] = \left[\begin{array}{c} r_1 - 1 \\ r_2 - 1 \\ r_3 - 1 \\ \vdots \\ r_k - 1 \end{array}\right].$$

Notice that the upper-left block of this matrix and the first $k-1$ entries of the right-hand vector form the system from Lemma 3.3 for the values $r_1 < r_2 < \cdots < r_{k-1}$. Thus, the existence of a positive integer solution $(x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ to our matrix equation above implies that $(x_1, \ldots, x_{k-1})$ are the multiplicities of a q-vector supported by $(r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_{k-1})$. Further, the final row of the matrix equation above implies that $r_k = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} x_i r_i$, from which it follows that $q = (r_1^{x_1}, \ldots, r_k^{x_k})$ arises from the free sum of $p = (r_1^{x_1}, \ldots, r_{k-1}^{x_{k-1}})$ and $q = (1^{x_k})$ by Theorem 2.3. □

Corollary 3.5. Let $q = (r_1^{x_1}, \ldots, r_k^{x_k})$ correspond to an IDP reflexive simplex satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 3.4. Then the simplices defined by the q-vectors $(r_1^{x_1}, \ldots, r_{k-1}^{x_{k-1}})$ and (1^{x_k}) are both IDP reflexive simplices.

Proof. It is straightfoward to see that the simplex defined by (1^{x_k}) is always reflexive and IDP, so it only remains to check that the simplex given by $(r_1^{x_1}, \ldots, r_{k-1}^{x_{k-1}})$ has the same properties. By Theorem 3.4 we know that $\Delta_{(1,q)} = \Delta_{(1,p)} *_0 \Delta_{(1,h)}$ where we set $p := (r_1^{x_1}, \ldots, r_{k-1}^{x_{k-1}})$ and $h := (1^{x_k})$. By Definition 2.2 the free sum $\Delta_{(1,p)} *_0 \Delta_{(1,h)}$ is structured so that $\Delta_{(1,p)}$ is a face of $\Delta_{(1,q)}$. Since by Theorem 3.4 we know that $\Delta_{(1,q)} = \Delta_{(1,p)} *_0 \Delta_{(1,h)}$ is IDP, and so each of its faces must also be IDP. The reflexive condition follows immediately from the analysis in the proof of Theorem 3.4. □

The next result shows that any family of IDP reflexive simplices supported by r-vectors for which $r_i \nmid r_k$ for some i is finite. In particular, there are at most finitely many such IDP reflexive simplices, which may or may not be decomposable as a free sum.

Theorem 3.6. Fix an r-vector $r = (r_1, \ldots, r_k)$ for which $r_i \nmid r_k$ for at least one i in $\{1, \ldots, k-1\}$. There are at most finitely many reflexive IDP $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ such that q is supported by $r = (r_1, \ldots, r_k)$.

Proof. If $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ is reflexive IDP and supported by r, then using the notation from Lemma 3.3 there is a positive integer vector x that satisfies $Rx = b$. The set of $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ that are reflexive IDP and supported by r corresponds to the integer points in $\mathbb{R}^k_{>0} \cap (x + \ker(R))$. Since $\ker(R)$ is orthogonal to the image of R^T, it follows from $r_i \nmid r_k$ for some i that there exists a strictly positive vector $a \in \mathrm{im}(R^T)$ orthogonal to $\ker(R)$, namely the vector a obtained as the sum of the transpose of the k-th row of R and the transpose of the i-th row of R. Hence, $\mathbb{R}^k_{>0} \cap (x + \ker(R))$ is bounded, and therefore contains at most a finite number of integer points. □

	h^*-unimodal	IDP	known free sum decomposition
$r_1 \mid r_2$	all vectors	all vectors	all vectors
$r_1 \nmid r_2$	all vectors	all vectors	none

TABLE 1. The IDP property and h^*-unimodality for q-vectors supported on two integers. The results are classified by the two divisibility cases of Lemma 3.3.

4. q-Vectors With Support on Two Integers

Using our previous results, we are now able to classify the IDP and reflexive $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ supported on two integers and show that they are all h^*-unimodal. Let $q = (r_1^{x_1}, r_2^{x_2})$ denote a q-vector supported on two vectors. By Lemma 3.3, in order to capture all IDP reflexive simplices supported on two integers we need to consider two cases given by the possible divisibility relations between r_1 and r_2. Table 1 summarizes the results of this section. For the two possible cases of q-vectors satisfying the conditions of Lemma 3.3, the table indicates if these simplices exhibit h^*-unimodality, the IDP, and/or a known free sum decomposition.

In Theorem 4.1 we classify all IDP reflexive simplices supported on two integers. We see there are exactly two types of IDP reflexive q-vectors, the former corresponding to the divisibility pattern $r_1 \mid r_2$ and the latter corresponding to $r_1 \nmid r_2$.

Theorem 4.1. Let $r < s$ be positive integers and let

$$q = (\underbrace{r, r, \ldots, r}_{m \text{ times}}, \underbrace{s, s, \ldots, s}_{x \text{ times}}) = (r^m, s^x)\,.$$

Then $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ is reflexive if and only if $r \mid (1 + sx)$ and $s \mid (1 + rm)$. Further, $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ is IDP reflexive if and only if either $r \neq 1$ with $s = 1 + rm$ and $x = r - 1$ or $r = 1$ with $s = 1 + m$ and x arbitrary.

Proof. The claim regarding reflexivity follows immediately from the condition that $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ is reflexive if and only if $q_j \mid (1 + q_1 + \cdots + q_n)$ for all j. To show that $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ being reflexive IDP implies $s = 1 + rm$ and $x = r - 1$ when $r \neq 1$, we apply Corollary 2.7. First, applying the corollary with $q_j = s$ we see that

$$\frac{1}{s} + m\left\{\frac{r}{s}\right\} + x\left\{\frac{s}{s}\right\} = \frac{1 + mr}{s} = 1\,,$$

and thus we have $1 + mr = s$. Second, setting $q_j = r$ and applying the corollary yields

$$\frac{1}{r} + m\left\{\frac{r}{r}\right\} + x\left\{\frac{s}{r}\right\} = \frac{1}{r} + x\left\{\frac{1 + mr}{r}\right\} = \frac{1 + x}{r} = 1\,,$$

from which it follows that $x = r - 1$. A similar argument shows that if $r = 1$, then $1 + m = s$ and x can be an arbitrary positive integer.

Next, assume that $s = 1 + mr$ and q is formed with $x = r - 1$, which Corollary 2.7 guarantees to be reflexive. To verify that $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ is IDP in this case, we will directly apply Theorem 2.6. Consider the case where $q_j = r$, hence $b = 0, 1, \ldots, r - 1$. In this case, since $0 \leq b < r$, it follows that (1) reduces to

$$b(rm - m + 1) - (r - 1)\left\lfloor \frac{brm + b}{r} \right\rfloor = b(rm - m + 1) - (r - 1)bm = b\,.$$

Thus, in this case, our only option for the c value in equations (2) and (3) is $c = 1$. When $q_i = r$ it is immediate that cancellation implies (2). We therefore need to check that (2) holds when $q_i = rm + 1$, $c = 1$, and $b = 2, 3, \ldots, r - 1$, which follows since

$$m + (b - 1)m = bm$$

if and only if

$$m + \left\lfloor \frac{(b - 1)mr + (b - 1)}{r} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{brm + b}{r} \right\rfloor$$

if and only if

$$\left\lfloor \frac{rm + 1}{r} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{(b - 1)(mr + 1)}{r} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{b(rm + 1)}{r} \right\rfloor\,.$$

Next consider the case where $q_j = rm + 1$, hence $b = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, rm$. For this value of q_j, (1) reduces to the following expression, which we denote by $h(b)$:

$$h(b) := b - m \left\lfloor \frac{br}{mr+1} \right\rfloor \tag{9}$$

It is straightforward to verify that when $b = km + l$ with $0 \leq l < m$, we have $h(0) = 0$, we have $h(km) = m$ when $l = 0$, and we have

$$h(km + l) = l$$

for $l \neq 0$, which follows directly from the following claim.

Claim: If $k < r$, then $\left\lfloor \frac{kmr + r}{mr+1} \right\rfloor = k$. This follows from the inequality

$$k(mr + 1) < kmr + r < (k + 1)(mr + 1)\,.$$

Thus, the viable candidates for c-values in (2) and (3) are

$$c = 1, m + 1, 2m + 1, \ldots, (r - 1)m + 1\,,$$

and all other values of b give values greater than or equal to two. To complete our proof, we need to check (2) and (3) for these values of b. We will show that for any such value of b, every viable c less than b will satisfy these equations.

Fix $b = am + d$ with $2 \leq d \leq m$ and $0 \leq a \leq (r - 1)$, and fix $c = km + 1$ with $k \leq a$, which ensures that $c < b$.

Claim: $\left\lfloor \frac{(am + d)r}{rm+1} \right\rfloor = a$. To prove this, we use the division algorithm to evaluate this quotient and obtain

$$amr + dr = a(rm + 1) + (dr - a)\,.$$

Because of the bounds on a and d we see that $0 \leq dr - a \leq mr$, thus this is the correct representation using the division algorithm, hence the claim follows.

Claim: $\left\lfloor \frac{r[(a - k)m + d - 1]}{rm+1} \right\rfloor = a - k$. To prove this, we again use the division algorithm to evaluate this quotient and obtain

$$(a - k)mr + (d - 1)r = (a - k)(rm + 1) + ((d - 1)r - (a - k))\,.$$

Because of the bounds on a, d, and k, it follows that

$$1 \leq (d - 1)r - (a - k) \leq (m - 1)r\,,$$

and thus this is the correct representation using the division algorithm. The claim follows.

Because $k \leq a < r$, it follows that

$$\left\lfloor \frac{(km + 1)r}{rm+1} \right\rfloor = k\,.$$

Combining this with our two claims above, it follows that

$$\left\lfloor \frac{(km + 1)r}{rm+1} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{r[(a - k)m + d - 1]}{rm+1} \right\rfloor = k + (a - k) = a = \left\lfloor \frac{(am + d)r}{rm+1} \right\rfloor\,,$$

which completes the proof. Note that this holds for any choice of $k \leq a$, hence for all $c < b$ with $h(c) = 1$.

Theorem 2.3 implies that if $q = (1^m, (1 + m)^x)$ for any positive integer x, then $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ is reflexive IDP. □

Our next two theorems show that the h^*-polynomials for these simplices are unimodal.

Theorem 4.2. Let $\Delta_{r,m}$ denote the polytope $\Delta_{(1,q)}$, where $q = (r^m, (rm + 1)^{r-1})$ with $r \neq 1$ is the vector corresponding to an IDP simplex as given in Theorem 4.1. Also let

$$p_{r,m}(z) := \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} (i + 1)z^i + r \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \frac{r+m-1}{2} \rfloor} \alpha_i z^i$$

where

$$\alpha_i := \begin{cases} \min\{i, m - 1\} & \text{if } m < r, \\ \min\{i, r\} & \text{if } m \geq r. \end{cases}$$

Then

$$h^*_{\Delta_{r,m}}(z) = p_{r,m}(z) + z^{r+m-1}p_{r,m}\left(\frac{1}{z}\right),$$

and this polynomial is unimodal.

Proof. The formula given in Theorem 2.5 reduces to

$$h^*_{\Delta_{r,m}}(z) = \sum_{b=0}^{r(rm+1)-1} z^{\omega(b)},$$

where

$$\omega(b) = b - (r-1)\left\lfloor \frac{b}{r} \right\rfloor - m\left\lfloor \frac{b}{rm+1} \right\rfloor.$$

To compute the desired formula for $h^*_{\Delta_{r,m}}(z)$ we first consider the sequence

$$W := \left(b - (r-1)\left\lfloor \frac{b}{r} \right\rfloor\right)_{b=0}^{r(rm+1)-1}.$$

We will now group the terms in this sequence into subsequences of length r, and collects these into blocks of m subsequences as this will help make the desired formula more apparent. Following this, we will subtract from each number in the sequence the value $m\left\lfloor \frac{b}{rm+1} \right\rfloor$ in order to produce the desired powers $w(b)$, but organized in a fashion which reveals the desired polynomial structure. We first note that

$$\begin{aligned} W &= \left(b - (r-1)\left\lfloor \frac{b}{r} \right\rfloor\right)_{b=0}^{r(rm+1)-1} \\ &= \left((i+j)_{j=0}^{r-1}\right)_{i=0}^{rm-1} \\ &= \left(\left((i+j)_{j=0}^{r-1}\right)_{i=s}^{s+m-1}\right)_{s=0}^{r-1}. \end{aligned}$$

In this grouping, each sequence of m sequences of length r

$$W_s := \left((i+j)_{j=0}^{r-1}\right)_{i=s}^{s+m-1}$$

accounts for rm powers $w(b)$. To compute the powers of $h^*_{\Delta_{r,m}}(z)$ we must subtract $m\left\lfloor \frac{b}{rm+1} \right\rfloor$ from each term in W. Since this subtraction causes the term to decrease by m each time $\left\lfloor \frac{b}{rm+1} \right\rfloor$ increases by 1 then for all $s = 0, 1, \ldots, r-1$, for every $i > sm$

$$(i+j)_{j=0}^{r-1} - m\left\lfloor \frac{b}{rm+1} \right\rfloor = (i+j-sm)_{j=0}^{r-1}.$$

Whereas, for $i = sm$

$$(i+j)_{j=0}^{r-1} - m\left\lfloor \frac{b}{rm+1} \right\rfloor = \left((sm+j-(s-1)m)_{j=0}^{s-1}, (j)_{j=s}^{r}\right) = \left((m+j)_{j=0}^{s-1}, (j)_{j=s}^{r}\right).$$

So for every $s = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, r-1$, we have that

$$W_s - m\left\lfloor \frac{b}{rm+1} \right\rfloor = \left(\left((m+j)_{j=0}^{s-1}, (j)_{j=s}^{r}\right), \left((i+j)_{j=0}^{r-1}\right)_{i=1}^{m-1}\right).$$

Notice that the sequence of coefficients $(m+j)_{j=0}^{s-1}$ gives the polynomial

$$z^m \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} z^j,$$

and the sequence $(j)_{j=s}^{r}$ yields

$$\sum_{j=s}^{r} z^j.$$

			h^*-unimodal	IDP	known free sum decomposition
$r_1 \mid r_2$	$r_1 \mid r_3$	$r_2 \mid r_3$	all vectors	all vectors	all vectors
$r_1 \mid r_2$	$r_1 \mid r_3$	$r_2 \nmid r_3$	all vectors	all vectors	all vectors
$r_1 \nmid r_2$	$r_1 \mid r_3$	$r_2 \mid r_3$	all vectors	all vectors	all vectors
$r_1 \nmid r_2$	$r_1 \mid r_3$	$r_2 \nmid r_3$	some but not all	some but not all	?
$r_1 \nmid r_2$	$r_1 \nmid r_3$	$r_2 \mid r_3$	all vectors	all vectors	none
$r_1 \nmid r_2$	$r_1 \nmid r_3$	$r_2 \nmid r_3$	?	?	?

TABLE 2. The IDP property and h^*-unimodality for q-vectors supported on three integers. The results are classified by the six divisibility cases of Lemma 3.3 that capture IDP simplices.

Varying over $s = 0, 1, \ldots, r-1$, the sum of these polynomials is

$$\sum_{i=0}^{r-1}(i+1)z^i + z^{r+m-1}\sum_{i=0}^{r-1}(i+1)\left(\frac{1}{z}\right)^i. \tag{10}$$

The sequence of coefficients $\left((i+j)_{j=0}^{r-1}\right)_{i=1}^{m-1}$ yields the polynomial

$$z\sum_{j=0}^{r-1} z^j + z^2\sum_{j=0}^{r-1} z^j + \cdots + z^{m-1}\sum_{j=0}^{r-1} z^j,$$

or equivalently,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \frac{r+m-1}{2} \rfloor} \alpha_i z^i + z^{r+m-1}\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \frac{r+m-1}{2} \rfloor} \alpha_i \left(\frac{1}{z}\right)^i. \tag{11}$$

Since the sum of one copy of (10) and r copies of (11) is a unimodal polynomial and gives the desired formula for $h^*_{\Delta_{r,m}}(z)$, this completes the proof. □

Theorem 4.3. If $q = (1^m, (1+m)^x)$, then $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ is h^*-unimodal.

Proof. In this case, $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ is the affine free sum $\Delta_{(1,q_1)} *_0 \Delta_{(1,q_2)}$, where $q_1 = (1^m)$ and $q_2 = (1^x)$. By Theorem 2.3, the resulting simplex is IDP, reflexive, and h^*-unimodal. □

5. q-Vectors With Support on Three Integers

Lemma 3.3 implies that in order for an r-vector $r = (r_1, r_2, r_3)$ to be a candidate for supporting an IDP reflexive $\Delta_{(1,q)}$, it must satisfy the following linear system with a positive integer solution:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & r_2 \bmod r_1 & r_3 \bmod r_1 \\ r_1 & 0 & r_3 \bmod r_2 \\ r_1 & r_2 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} r_1 - 1 \\ r_2 - 1 \\ r_3 - 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

It is not clear in general how to identify the r-vectors for which a positive integer solution to this system exists, let alone those for which both reflexivity and IDP hold, thus we consider our analysis by cases based on divisibility among the r_i's. Given that it is not possible for $r_1 \mid r_2$, $r_2 \mid r_3$, and $r_1 \nmid r_3$, there are seven possible divisibility relations among the r_i's, leading to seven cases in which to consider the application of Lemma 3.3. Furthermore, we will see in Theorem 5.1 that there are no IDP reflexive simplices supported on an r-vector satisfying $r_1 \mid r_2$, $r_1 \nmid r_3$, and $r_2 \nmid r_3$. Thus, there are a total of six cases for which we must check the validity of Conjecture 1.3. Similar to section 4, we summarize the results of this section in a table. For the six possible cases of q-vectors satisfying the conditions of Lemma 3.3 and capturing IDP simplices, Table 2 indicates if these simplices exhibit h^*-unimodality, the IDP, and/or a known free sum decomposition.

Our first theorem shows that the linear system from Lemma 3.3 need not have a positive integer solution.

Theorem 5.1. Suppose the r-vector $r = (r_1, r_2, r_3)$ satisfies $r_1 \mid r_2$, $r_1 \nmid r_3$, and $r_2 \nmid r_3$. If r also satisfies Lemma 3.3, then r does not support any q-vectors.

Proof. If such a q-vector were to exist, it would have the form

$$q = (s^{x_1}, (st)^{x_2}, ((mt+k)s+r)^{x_3})$$

for some integers $s, m \geq 1$, $t \geq 2$, $0 \leq k < t$, $0 < r < s$, and $x_1, x_2, x_3 > 0$. To solve for the x_i's we consider

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & r \\ s & 0 & ks+r \\ s & st & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} s-1 \\ st-1 \\ (mt+k)s+r-1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Solving the first row of this system forces $rx_3 = s-1$, hence there must exist some $s-1 \geq d \geq 1$ such that $rd = s-1$, hence $x_3 = d$. This forces the second row to imply $x_1 = t - kd - 1$; if x_1 is to be positive, this implies $t - kd - 1 > 0$. These values of x_2 and x_3 lead to the third row having the form

$$x_2 = \frac{mts + ks + r - 1 - st - skd - s}{st}.$$

Since $0 < r < s$ and we must have that s divides the numerator of this expression, it follows that $r = 1$, which forces $d = s-1$, and thus $s \geq 2$. Thus, the above fraction simplifies to

$$x_2 = \frac{t(m-1) + k - (kd+1)}{t}.$$

If x_2 is to be a positive integer, we must have that t divides the numerator, hence $t \mid k-(kd+1) = k(2-s)-1$. Since $s \geq 2$, we have $2 - s \leq 0$, and hence

$$0 \geq k(2-s) - 1 = k - (kd+1) \geq -(kd+1) < -t.$$

Thus t divides $k(2-s)-1$ only if $k(2-s) = 1$, which is impossible since $k > 0$ and $2 - s \leq 0$. Thus, there is no vector of this type supporting an IDP reflexive. □

Our next three results showcase the role played by affine free sums and Theorem 3.4.

Theorem 5.2. Suppose the r-vector $r = (r_1, r_2, r_3)$ satisfies $r_1 \mid r_2 \mid r_3$. If r also satisfies the Lemma 3.3, then any q-vector supported on r has the following form. For each s, m, x such that $s, m, x > 1$, set

$$q = (1^{m-1}, m^{s-1}, (sm)^x).$$

Moreover, these simplices are all IDP and have unimodal h^*-vectors.

Proof. Our linear system from Lemma 3.3 is of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ r_1 & 0 & 0 \\ r_1 & r_2 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} r_1 - 1 \\ r_2 - 1 \\ r_3 - 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Thus, $r_1 = 1$, hence $x_1 = r_2 - 1$ and $x_3 = x$ can be arbitrary. Setting $(r_1, r_2, r_3) = (1, m, ms)$, it follows that

$$q = (1^{m-1}, m^{s-1}, (sm)^x).$$

Using Theorem 3.4, we know that these simplices may be expressed as the affine free sum $(\Delta_{(1,q_1)} *_0 \Delta_{(1,q_2)}) *_0 \Delta_{(1,q_3)}$, where $q_1 = (1^{m-1})$, $q_2 = (1^{s-1})$, and $q_3 = (1^x)$. Theorem 2.3 then implies that these simplices are IDP, reflexive, and h^*-unimodal. □

Theorem 5.3. Suppose the r-vector $r = (r_1, r_2, r_3)$ satisfies $r_1 \nmid r_2$, $r_1 \mid r_3$, and $r_2 \mid r_3$. If r also satisfies the Lemma 3.3, then any q-vector supported on r has the following form. For each s, m, x such that $s, m \geq 1$ and $x \geq 0$, set

$$q = (s^m, (ms+1)^{s-1}, (s(ms+1))^x).$$

Moreover, these simplices are all IDP and have unimodal h^*-vectors.

Proof. Suppose we set $r_1 = s$, $r_2 = ms + t$, and $r_3 = u(ms+t)$ for some $0 \leq t < s$ and $u \geq 1$. The second equation in the linear system from Lemma 3.3 is of the form

$$sx_1 = ms + t - 1.$$

This implies $s \mid t - 1$, but since $t < s$ and $s \neq 1$, t must be 1. Therefore, $x_1 = m$, and the first line of the linear system is simply $x_2 = s - 1$.

The last equation in the system gives

$$ms + (ms+1)(s-1) = u(ms+1) - 1.$$

Solving for u, we get $s = u$, so then $r_3 = s(ms+1)$. Since x_3 is a free variable, we may have as many copies of $s(ms+1)$ in q as we like.

Note that by Theorem 3.4, $q = (s^m, (ms+1)^{s-1}, (s(ms+1))^x)$ arises as the affine free sum $(\Delta_{(1,q_1)} *_0 \Delta_{(1,q_2)})$, where $q_1 = (s^m, (ms+1)^{s-1})$ and $q_2 = (1^x)$. This implies that these simplices are reflexive, IDP, and h^*-unimodal. □

Theorem 5.4. Consider r-vectors $r = (r_1, r_2, r_3)$ satisfying $r_1 \mid r_2$, $r_1 \mid r_3$, and $r_2 \nmid r_3$. For any $k, d > 1$ such that $kd = r$, the vector $(1^{k-1}, r^m, (mr+k)^{d-1})$ corresponds to a reflexive simplex, and these are the only reflexive simplices $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ that simultaneously satisfy these divisibility conditions and Lemma 3.3. Moreover, each of these simplices is IDP and h^*-unimodal.

Proof. If $r_1 \mid r_2$ and $r_1 \mid r_3$, then it follows that $r_1 = 1$ by the first line of $Rx = b$, so we are in the case where $(r_1, r_2, r_3) = (1, r, mr+k)$ for $0 < k < r$. By Theorem 3.6, there are at most a finite number of IDP reflexives supported by this vector. We first apply Lemma 3.3 to identify potential x_1, x_2, x_3-values; if $(1^{x_1}, r^{x_2}, (mr+k)^{x_3})$ corresponds to an IDP reflexive, then there must be a positive integer solution to the linear system

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1/r & 0 & k/r \\ 1/(mk+r) & r/(mk+r) & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - 1/1 \\ 1 - 1/r \\ 1 - 1/(mr+k) \end{bmatrix}$$

Noting that the first row is a zero equation, and scaling the other two rows to clear denominators, we obtain

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & k \\ 1 & r & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} r-1 \\ mr+k-1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Because any solution to this system is restricted to positive integers, the first equation above forces $0 < x_1 < r-1$, which in turn when combined with the second equationforces $x_2 = m$. Hence $x_1 = k-1$ and $x_3 = (r-k)/k$. Thus, if a positive integer solution is possible, it must be that $k \mid r$ is a proper divisor of r. Thus, for any $k, d > 1$ such that $kd = r$, we see that the vector $(1^{k-1}, r^m, (mr+k)^{d-1})$ corresponds to a reflexive simplex.

Note that $q_1 = (1^{k-1})$and $q_2 = (d^m, (md+1)^{d-1})$ are both valid q-vectors. The former is well-known to have an h^*-vector of $(1, \ldots, 1)$. The latter corresponds to an IDP, reflexive, and h^*-unimodal simplex by Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2. Thus, $(1^{k-1}, r^m, (mr+k)^{d-1})$ arises as the q-vector of the affine free sum $\Delta_{(1,q_1)} *_0 \Delta_{(1,q_2)}$, and from Theorem 2.3 we draw the conclusion that $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ is also reflexive, IDP, and h^*-unimodal. □

Our next theorem establishes that in the case of q-vectors with support on three integers, classes of IDP reflexive simplices arise that do not all decompose as affine free sums. For example, setting $s = 6, t = 3, r = 1$ in the theorem below yields $q = (6, 7, 7, 21)$ with h^*-polynomial $1 + 11z + 18z^2 + 11z^3 + z^4$. Since this h^*-polynomial is irreducible over the integers, $\Delta_{(1,6,7,7,21)}$ does not admit a free sum decomposition [1]. Note, however, the close resemblance between these vectors and those formed by the affine free sum construction.

Theorem 5.5. Suppose the triple $r_1 < r_2 < r_3$ satisfies $r_1 \nmid r_2$, $r_1 \nmid r_3$, and $r_2 \mid r_3$. Every q-vector supported on three integers satisfying these conditions that also satisfies Lemma 3.3 has the following form. For each s, t, r such that $s > 1$, $0 < t < s$ with $t \mid s$, and $r \geq 1$, set

$$q = (s^r, (rs+1)^{t-1}, (t(rs+1))^{s/t-1}).$$

For every such q, $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ is IDP.

Proof. Since r_1 does not divide either of r_2, r_3, we see that $r_1 > 1$. Thus, the divisibility conditions imply that (r_1, r_2, r_3) is of the form $(s, rs+k, mrs+\ell s+t)$ for some $s > 1$, $r \geq 1$, $m > 1$, where $km = \ell s + t$ with $0 < k < s$ and $0 < t < s$. Lemma 3.3 implies that our necessary linear system is

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & k & t \\ s & 0 & 0 \\ s & rs+k & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} s-1 \\ rs+k-1 \\ mrs+\ell s+t-1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Gaussian elimination on this system leads to the solutions

$$x_1 = \frac{rs+k-1}{s}\,,$$
$$x_2 = \frac{((m-1)r+\ell)s+t-k}{rs+k}\,,$$

and

$$x_3 = \frac{(s-1)(rs+k)-k[((m-1)r+\ell)s+t-k]}{t(rs+k)}\,.$$

Since x_1 must be a positive integer, we see that $s \mid k-1$; by assumption $0 < k-1 < s-1$, hence $k = 1$. Thus, $x_1 = r$. Knowing that $k = 1$, x_2 simplifies to $m-1$ and $x_3 = \frac{s-m}{t}$. Since x_3 is a positive integer, we need that $t \mid (s-m)$, which forces $m < s$. However, $m = \ell s + t$ and $m < s$ implies $m = t$. Thus, $x_2 = t-1$ and $x_3 = \frac{s}{t} - 1$, which implies that $t \mid s$, completing the identification of the necessary x-values.

We next verify IDP using Theorem 2.6. Throughout, we use the notation

$$h(b) := b\left(\frac{1+\sum_{i\neq j} q_i}{q_j}\right) - \sum_{i\neq j}\left\lfloor \frac{bq_i}{q_j}\right\rfloor\,.$$

Case: $q_j = s$. It is straightforward to verify that

$$h(b) = b - (s/t-1)\left\lfloor\frac{bt}{s}\right\rfloor\,,$$

and using this formula one can check that

$$h(ks/t) = k\,.$$

Combining these two observations, it follows that $h(b) = 1$ only when $b = 1$ and $b = s/t$, thus identifying the b-values we are required to check in (1). To verify that (2) always has the desired solution, we consider three cases. If $q_i = s$, the result is trivial. If $q_i = rs+1$, then we may select $c = 1$, from which it follows that both sides of (2) are equal to $r(b-1)$. If $q_i = t(rs+1)$, then we set $c = s/t$, from which it is straightforward to compute that both sides of (2) are equal to $btr - rs - 1 + \lfloor bt/s\rfloor$. This completes our first case.

Case: $q_j = rs+1$. It is straightforward to verify that

$$h(b) = b - r\left\lfloor\frac{bs}{rs+1}\right\rfloor\,.$$

As we are considering values of b ranging from 1 to rs, we see that this analysis is identical to that undertaken in the proof of Theorem 4.1 starting from (9). To verify that (2) always has the desired solution, we consider three cases. If $q_i = rs+1$, the result is trivial. If $q_i = s$, then the analysis is identical to that given following (9) in our proof of Theorem 4.1. If $q_i = t(rs+1)$, then we can set $c = 1$ and the result is immediate. This completes our second case.

Case: $q_j = t(rs+1)$. Set $d = s/t$. We first identify those values of b that satisfy (1) and (3). It is straightforward to verify that

$$h(b) = b - r\left\lfloor\frac{bd}{rs+1}\right\rfloor - (t-1)\left\lfloor\frac{b}{t}\right\rfloor\,.$$

Writing $b = mt+\ell$ where $0 \le m \le rs$ and $0 \le \ell \le t$, it follows that

$$h(b) = h(mt+\ell) = m + \ell - r\left\lfloor\frac{ms+\ell d}{rs+1}\right\rfloor\,.$$

We can now further divide into cases: either we have $m = rs$ or we have $m = kr+w$ where $0 \le k < s$ and $0 \le w < r$, which yields

$$h(b) = h((kr+w)t+\ell) = w + \ell - r\left\lfloor\frac{ws+\ell d-k}{rs+1}\right\rfloor\,.$$

For $m \neq rs$, observe that since $0 \le ws \le r-1$ and $0 \le \ell d < s$, with $0 \le k < s$, we have that $0 \le ws+\ell d < rs$. Thus, $\left\lfloor\frac{ws+\ell d-k}{rs+1}\right\rfloor$ is equal to either 0 or -1.

Subcase 1 of 3: Suppose $m = rs$. Since $0 \le \ell d < s$, we have

$$h(srt+\ell) = \ell - r\left\lfloor\frac{\ell d - s}{rs+1}\right\rfloor = \ell + r.$$

If this is equal to 1, then it must be that $\ell = 0$ and $r = 1$. Thus, if $r = 1$, we have that $h(st) = 1$.

Subcase 2 of 3: Suppose now that $m \neq rs$ and that

$$\left\lfloor \frac{ws + \ell d - k}{rs + 1} \right\rfloor = -1 .$$

Then since $w, \ell \geq 0$ and $r \geq 1$, we have $h(b) = w + \ell + r = 1$ which forces $w = \ell = 0$ and $r = 1$. In this case, $h(kt) = 1$ any time that $k > 0$. Thus, if $r = 1$, we have that $h(kt) = 1$ when $0 < k < s$.

Subcase 3 of 3: Suppose again that $m \neq rs$ and that

$$\left\lfloor \frac{ws + \ell d - k}{rs + 1} \right\rfloor = 0 .$$

Then $0 \leq k \leq ws + \ell d$, which implies that either (A) $0 < w < r$ with $0 \leq \ell < t$ or (B) $w = 0$ with $k \leq \ell d$. If (A) holds, then $h(b) = w + \ell = 1$ forces $w = 1$ and $\ell = 0$ since $w > 0$, which means that $h(b) = 1$ when $b = (kr + 1)t$ for $0 \leq k < s$. If (B) holds, then our same equation forces $w = 0$ and $\ell = 1$ when $k \leq d$, which means that $h(b) = 1$ when $b = krt + 1$ for $0 \leq k < s$ and $k \leq d$.

We summarize the values of b for which $h(b) = 1$ that were just derived:

- If $r = 1$ and $0 < k \leq s$ we have $b = kt$.
- If $r \geq 1$ and $0 \leq k < s$, we have $b = (kr + 1)t$.
- If $r \geq 1$ and $0 \leq k < s$ and $k \leq d$, we have $b = krt + 1$.

Our next goal is to establish that (2) is always satisfied; recall that we are in the case where $q_j = t(rs+1)$. If $q_i = t(rs + 1)$, then (2) is trivially satisfied. If $q_i = rs + 1$, we write $b = mt + \ell$ where $0 \leq m < rs + 1$ and $0 \leq \ell < t$. Substituting this form of b into (2) yields the equation

$$-\left\lfloor \frac{c}{t} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{\ell - c}{t} \right\rfloor .$$

If $b > t$, we set $c = t$ and the equation is satisfied. If $2 < b < t$, then we set $c = 1$ and the equation is satisfied.

If $q_i = s$, the analysis becomes more complicated. We first define $d = s/t$ and write $b = mt + \ell$ where $0 \leq m < d$ and $0 \leq \ell < t$. Our argument will proceed by considering $r = 1$ and $r > 1$ separately.

Suppose $r = 1$. Then the left-hand-side of (2) is reduced to

$$\left\lfloor \frac{\ell d - m}{s + 1} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{cd}{s + 1} \right\rfloor$$

and the right-hand-side to

$$\left\lfloor \frac{\ell d - m - cd}{s + 1} \right\rfloor .$$

Since $m < d$, if $\ell d - m < 0$ this forces $\ell = 0$ and $0 < m$, thus b is a multiple of t, and we found earlier that $h(mt) = 1$. Thus, we need proceed no further. If $\ell d - m \geq 0$, then since $m < d$ we must have $\ell \geq 1$, and we also have $\ell d - m < s$. Thus, $\left\lfloor \frac{\ell d - m}{s+1} \right\rfloor = 0$, from which it follows that (2) reduces to

$$-\left\lfloor \frac{cd}{s + 1} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{\ell d - m - cd}{s + 1} \right\rfloor .$$

If $m = 0$, set $c = 1$ and this equation is solved. If $m \geq 1$, set $c = mt + 1$ which is less than b in this case, and this equation is again satisfied. This completes our proof for $r = 1$.

We next consider when $r \geq 2$, maintaining our previous notation of $b = mt + \ell$. Write $m = fr + g$ where $0 \leq f \leq \lfloor d/r \rfloor$ and $0 \leq g < r$ except in the case where $f = \lfloor d/r \rfloor$ in which case g is bounded above by $d - d\lfloor d/r \rfloor$. This leads to the left-hand-side of (2) having the form

$$f + \left\lfloor \frac{gs + \ell d - f}{rs + 1} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{cd}{rs + 1} \right\rfloor$$

while the right-hand-side has the form

$$f + \left\lfloor \frac{gs + \ell d - f - cd}{rs + 1} \right\rfloor .$$

We thus need to solve the equation

$$\left\lfloor \frac{gs+\ell d-f}{rs+1} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{cd}{rs+1} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{gs+\ell d-f-cd}{rs+1} \right\rfloor$$

subject to the constraints $0 \leq g < r$ (with the exception mentioned above), $0 \leq \ell \leq t$, and $\leq f \leq \lfloor d/r \rfloor$. Note that the first two inequalities imply that $0 \leq gs + \ell d < rs$, and also $f \leq \lfloor d/r \rfloor \leq s$, hence

$$\left\lfloor \frac{gs+\ell d-f}{rs+1} \right\rfloor = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } gs+\ell d \geq f \\ -1 & \text{if } gs+\ell d < f \end{cases}$$

Subcase 1 of 2: Suppose $gs + \ell d - f \geq 0$. Then (2) reduces to

$$-\left\lfloor \frac{cd}{rs+1} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{gs+\ell d-f-cd}{rs+1} \right\rfloor .$$

Note that $f \leq \lfloor d/r \rfloor < d$, and thus we can set $c = frt + 1$ which is less than b. The left-hand-side of our above equation is given by

$$-\left\lfloor \frac{(frt+1)d}{rs+1} \right\rfloor = -\left\lfloor \frac{frs+d}{rs+1} \right\rfloor = -\left\lfloor \frac{-frs+f+d-f}{rs+1} \right\rfloor = -f\,.$$

Similarly, the right-hand-side of our equation is given by

$$-f + \left\lfloor \frac{f-d+gs+\ell d-f}{rs+1} \right\rfloor = -f + \left\lfloor \frac{-d+gs+\ell d}{rs+1} \right\rfloor ,.$$

Since $h(b)$ is assumed to be at least 2, we have that one or both of g and ℓ are non-zero. Combining this observation with $gs + \ell d - f \geq 0$ it follows that $gs + \ell d > 0$. Note that $d \mid (gs + \ell d)$, and thus $rs + 1 > gs + \ell d - d \geq 0$, which forces the right-hand-side of our equation to equal $-f$, satisfying (2).

Subcase 2 of 2: Suppose $gs + \ell d - f < 0$. Note that since $g, s, \ell, d \geq 0$, it follows that $f \geq 1$ and thus $b = (fr + g)t + \ell \geq t$. Set $c = t$, which is less than b. With these conditions, the left-hand-side of (2) is easily seen to equal -1. The right-hand-side of (2) is given by

$$\left\lfloor \frac{gs+\ell d-f-s}{rs+1} \right\rfloor .$$

Since $gs + \ell d - f < 0$ and $-s < 0$, the numerator above is strictly negative. Also, since $g, s, \ell, d \geq 0$, the numerator is minimized by $-f - s > -d - s \geq -2s$. But, since we assumed that $r \geq 2$, it follows that $rs + 1 > 2s$ and thus the floor function above is equal to -1, satisfying equality for (2).

This completes the proof establishing the IDP property. □

In the following two remarks, we discuss the remaining divisibility cases, which are significantly more complicated.

Remark 5.6. Suppose the r-vector $r = (r_1, r_2, r_3)$ satisfies $r_1 \nmid r_2$, $r_1 \mid r_3$, and $r_2 \nmid r_3$. Then r_1, r_2, and r_3 are of the forms $r_1 = s$ for some $s > 1$, $r_2 = ms + t$ for some $m \geq 1$ and $0 < t < s$, and $r_3 = u(ms + t) + v$ for some $u \geq 1$ and $0 < v < ms + t$. Moreover, since $r_1 \mid r_3$, we must have $ut + v = ks$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Every q-vector supported on r_1, r_2, r_3 that also satisfies Lemma 3.3 has the following form:

$$q = (s^{mu+k-1-\frac{m(s-1)}{t}}, (ms+t)^{(s-1)/t}, (u(ms+t)+v)^{\alpha}),$$

where $\alpha = \frac{1}{tv}(ms(t - tu + s - 1) + t(t - 1 - s(k - 1)))$.

To see this, note that, since $r_3 \bmod r_1 = 0$, the linear system of Lemma 3.3 reduces to

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & t & 0 \\ s & 0 & v \\ s & ms+t & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} s-1 \\ ms+t-1 \\ u(ms+t)+v-1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The first equation of this system gives us $tx_2 = s-1$, so $x_2 = (s-1)/t$. The third equation of the system gives $sx_1 + (ms+t)x_2 = u(ms+t)+v-1$, so solving for x_1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= \frac{u(ms+t)+v-1-(ms+t)\frac{s-1}{t}}{s} \\ &= \frac{tu(ms+t)+tv-t-(ms+t)(s-1)}{st} \\ &= mu+k+\frac{-t-ms(s-1)-t(s-1)}{st} \\ &= mu+k+\frac{-st-ms(s-1)}{st} \\ &= mu+k-1-\frac{m(s-1)}{t}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the second equation of the linear system will give $sx_1 + vx_3 = ms+t-1$, so solving for x_3 yields

$$\begin{aligned} x_3 &= \frac{ms+t-1-s(mu+k-1-\frac{m(s-1)}{t})}{v} \\ &= \frac{tms+t^2-t-mstu-kst+st+ms(s-1)}{tv} \\ &= \frac{ms(t-tu+s-1)+t(t-1-s(k-1))}{tv}. \end{aligned}$$

Unlike our previous cases, the above conditions on x_1, x_2, and x_3 are necessary for $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ to be IDP but are not sufficient. For example, the vector $q = (2,2,15,20,20)$ examined in the proof of Corollary 2.7 does produce a reflexive simplex $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ and does satisfy the conditions of the previous result, yet fails to be IDP. However, it is straightforward to verify that the h^*-polynomial for $\Delta_{(1,2,2,15,20,20)}$ has coefficients $(1,9,20,20,9,1)$, hence is unimodal. Other non-IDP q-vectors with unimodal h^*-polynomials, all found via computer search, include $(2,9,12,12)$, $(2,2,15,20,20)$, $(2,2,2,21,28,28)$, $(2,15,18,18,18,18)$, and $(3,16,16,36,36,36)$.

Even more striking is that the vector $q = (3,20,24,24,24,24)$ satisfies these divisibility conditions and Lemma 3.3, yet is non-IDP and has a non-unimodal h^*-vector, specifically

$$h^*(\Delta_{(1,q)}; z) = z^6 + 16z^5 + 29z^4 + 28z^3 + 29z^2 + 16z + 1\,.$$

It remains a challenge to provide a more clear classification and description of the behavior of the q-vectors satisfying Lemma 3.3 in this case.

Remark 5.7. The last case to check is when $r_1 \nmid r_2, r_1 \nmid r_3$, and $r_2 \nmid r_3$. If we proceed as usual, using Lemma 3.3, the linear system we produce is rather unwieldy. Computational data suggests that when this is the support of q, the corresponding reflexive simplex is IDP. This has been checked for all possible $r_1 = s$, $r_2 = ms+t$, $r_3 = u(ms+t)+v$ with $s \leq 25$ and $m, u \leq 10$ satisfying $r_1 \nmid r_2$, $r_1 \nmid r_3$, and $r_2 \nmid r_3$, and for every resulting q-vector $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ was both IDP and h^*-unimodal. However, this search only resulted in 33 distinct reflexive simplices, listed in Figure 1.

For those reflexive IDP simplices $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ that do not arise via the free sum construction, we need to verify h^*-unimodality in an alternative manner. The proof techniques for the following result are essentially the same as that of Theorem 4.2.

Theorem 5.8. For each triplet of integers s, t, and r satisfying $s > 1$, $0 < t < s$ with $t \mid s$, and $r \geq 1$ the reflexive lattice simplex $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ with

$$q = (s^r, (rs+1)^{t-1}, (t(rs+1))^{s/t-1})$$

has a unimodal h^*-polynomial.

Proof. Let $s = \phi t$ for some integer $\phi > 1$. Notice first that $1+\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i = s(rs+1)$. Therefore, by Theorem 2.5

$$h^*(\Delta_{(1,q)}; z) = \sum_{b=0}^{s(rs+1)-1} z^{\omega(b)},$$

r-vector	$h^*(\Delta_{(1,q)}; z)$
$(6^5, 62^1, 93^1)$	$(1, 20, 36, 36, 36, 36, 20, 1)$
$(6^4, 50^1, 75^1)$	$(1, 20, 36, 36, 36, 20, 1)$
$(6^3, 38^1, 57^1)$	$(1, 20, 36, 36, 20, 1)$
$(6^2, 26^1, 39^1)$	$(1, 20, 36, 20, 1)$
$(6^1, 14^1, 21^1)$	$(1, 20, 20, 1)$
$(10^5, 102^2, 255^1)$	$(1, 28, 76, 100, 100, 100, 76, 28, 1)$
$(10^4, 82^2, 205^1)$	$(1, 28, 76, 100, 100, 76, 28, 1)$
$(10^3, 62^2, 155^1)$	$(1, 28, 76, 100, 76, 28, 1)$
$(10^2, 42^2, 105^1)$	$(1, 28, 76, 76, 28, 1)$
$(10^1, 22^2, 55^1)$	$(1, 28, 52, 28, 1)$
$(12^3, 111^1, 148^2)$	$(1, 40, 109, 144, 109, 40, 1)$
$(12^2, 75^1, 100^2)$	$(1, 40, 109, 109, 40, 1)$
$(12^1, 39^1, 52^2)$	$(1, 40, 74, 40, 1)$
$(14^5, 142^3, 497^1)$	$(1, 36, 100, 164, 196, 196, 164, 100, 36, 1)$
$(14^4, 114^3, 399^1)$	$(1, 36, 100, 164, 196, 164, 100, 36, 1)$
$(14^3, 86^3, 301^1)$	$(1, 36, 100, 164, 164, 100, 36, 1)$
$(14^2, 58^3, 203^1)$	$(1, 36, 100, 132, 100, 36, 1)$
$(14^1, 30^3, 105^1)$	$(1, 36, 68, 68, 36, 1)$
$(18^5, 182^4, 819^1)$	$(1, 44, 124, 204, 284, 324, 284, 204, 124, 44, 1)$
$(18^4, 146^4, 657^1)$	$(1, 44, 124, 204, 284, 284, 204, 124, 44, 1)$
$(18^3, 110^4, 495^1)$	$(1, 44, 124, 204, 244, 204, 124, 44, 1)$
$(18^2, 74^4, 333^1)$	$(1, 44, 124, 164, 164, 124, 44, 1)$
$(18^1, 38^4, 171^1)$	$(1, 44, 84, 84, 84, 44, 1)$
$(20^2, 164^1, 205^3)$	$(1, 72, 203, 268, 203, 72, 1)$
$(20^1, 84^1, 105^3)$	$(1, 72, 137, 137, 72, 1)$
$(21^3, 192^2, 448^2)$	$(1, 61, 225, 385, 385, 225, 61, 1)$
$(21^2, 129^2, 301^2)$	$(1, 61, 225, 329, 225, 61, 1)$
$(21^1, 66^2, 154^2)$	$(1, 61, 169, 169, 61, 1)$
$(22^5, 222^5, 1221^1)$	$(1, 52, 148, 244, 340, 436, 436, 340, 244, 148, 52, 1)$
$(22^4, 178^5, 979^1)$	$(1, 52, 148, 244, 340, 388, 340, 244, 148, 52, 1)$
$(22^3, 134^5, 737^1)$	$(1, 52, 148, 244, 292, 292, 244, 148, 52, 1)$
$(22^2, 90^5, 495^1)$	$(1, 52, 148, 196, 196, 196, 148, 52, 1)$
$(22^1, 46^5, 253^1)$	$(1, 52, 100, 100, 100, 100, 52, 1)$

FIGURE 1. The 33 reflexive simplices described in Remark 5.7 and their h^*-polynomials.

where

$$\omega(b) = b - r\left\lfloor \frac{b}{rs+1} \right\rfloor - (t-1)\left\lfloor \frac{b}{s} \right\rfloor - (\phi - 1)\left\lfloor \frac{b}{\phi} \right\rfloor.$$

Consider the sequence

$$W := \left(b - (\phi - 1)\left\lfloor \frac{b}{\phi} \right\rfloor \right)_{b=0}^{s(rs+1)-1}.$$

We first group W into subsequences of length ϕ, which we then group into sequences of ϕ-sequences of length t (so each t-sequence of ϕ-sequences consists of s terms of W). Since W consists of $s(rs+1)$ terms, there are exactly $sr+1$ of these t-sequences. We group the first rs of these t-sequences into sequences of r t-sequences. This presentation of W looks like

$$W = \left(\left(\left(\left((i+j)_{j=0}^{\phi-1} \right)_{i=\ell t}^{\ell t+t-1} \right)_{\ell=kr}^{kr+r-1} \right)_{k=0}^{s-1}, \left((srt+i+j)_{j=0}^{\phi-1} \right)_{i=0}^{t-1} \right).$$

We then subtract $(t-1)\left\lfloor \frac{b}{s} \right\rfloor$ from each term in W. Since this subtraction causes each term to decrease by $(t-1)$ every time $\left\lfloor \frac{b}{s} \right\rfloor$ increases by 1, which happens at the start of each new t-sequence then

$$W = \left(\left(\left(\left((i+j+\ell(t-1))_{j=0}^{\phi-1} \right)_{i=\ell t}^{\ell t+t-1} \right)_{\ell=kr}^{kr+r-1} \right)_{k=0}^{s-1}, \left((srt+i+j-rs(t-1))_{j=0}^{\phi-1} \right)_{i=0}^{t-1} \right),$$
$$= \left(\left(\left(\left((i+j+\ell)_{j=0}^{\phi-1} \right)_{i=0}^{t-1} \right)_{\ell=kr}^{kr+r-1} \right)_{k=0}^{s-1}, \left((i+j+rs)_{j=0}^{\phi-1} \right)_{i=0}^{t-1} \right).$$

Now, from each term in W we must subtract $r\left\lfloor \frac{b}{sr+1} \right\rfloor$. Thus, we subtract one more copy of r each time $\left\lfloor \frac{b}{sr+1} \right\rfloor$ increases by 1. For the first sr t-sequences (containing s elements of W each), the value $\left\lfloor \frac{b}{sr+1} \right\rfloor$ increases at the $(ksr+k)^{th}$ term of W for $k = 1, 2, \ldots, s-1$, and therefore is constant on each t-sequence in the r-sequence

$$\left(\left((i+j+\ell)_{j=0}^{\phi-1} \right)_{i=0}^{t-1} \right)_{\ell=kr}^{kr+r-1}$$

except for the very first t-sequence, corresponding to $\ell = kr$. Thus, for a fixed $k \in [s-1]$, and all $\ell > kr$ we subtract kr from each term of the t-sequence:

$$\left(\left((i+j+\ell-kr)_{j=0}^{\phi-1} \right)_{i=0}^{t-1} \right)_{\ell=kr+1}^{kr+r-1} = \left(\left((i+j+\ell)_{j=0}^{\phi-1} \right)_{i=0}^{t-1} \right)_{\ell=1}^{r-1}. \tag{12}$$

Similarly, when $k = 0$, this reduction applies to all t-sequences in the 0^{th} r-sequence:

$$\left(\left((i+j+\ell-kr)_{j=0}^{\phi-1} \right)_{i=0}^{t-1} \right)_{\ell=kr+1}^{kr+r-1} = \left(\left((i+j+\ell)_{j=0}^{\phi-1} \right)_{i=0}^{t-1} \right)_{\ell=0}^{r-1}. \tag{13}$$

As for the first t-sequence of all r-sequences with $k = 1, 2, \ldots, s-1$, the location of the $(ksr+k)^{th}$ term of W determines precisely where $\left\lfloor \frac{b}{sr+1} \right\rfloor$ increases from $k-1$ to k. Notice, we can consider the final t-sequence (i.e. the $(sr+1)^{st}$ t-sequence) with this collection simply by letting $k = 1, 2, \ldots, s$. So we must determine which ϕ-sequence of the t-sequence contains this term.

Recall that $s = \phi t$ and $k = 1, 2, \ldots, s$. So when the integer k lies in the interval $[(\alpha-1)\phi+1, \alpha\phi]$ then the first $\alpha-1$ ϕ-sequences lose $r(k-1)$ and the last $t-\alpha$ ϕ-sequences lose rk when we subtract off $\left\lfloor \frac{b}{sr+1} \right\rfloor$. Consider a fixed $\ell = kr$ for a fixed $k = 1, 2, \ldots, s$. The corresponding t-sequence is

$$\left((i+j+kr)_{j=0}^{\phi-1} \right)_{i=0}^{t-1}.$$

As $\alpha \in [t]$ varies, we get the sequences

$$\left((i+j+kr-r(k-1))_{j=0}^{\phi-1} \right)_{i=0}^{\alpha-2} = \left((i+j+r)_{j=0}^{\phi-1} \right)_{i=0}^{\alpha-2},$$

for the ϕ-sequences before the α^{th} ϕ-sequence and

$$\left((i+j+kr-kr)_{j=0}^{\phi-1} \right)_{i=\alpha}^{t-1} = \left((i+j+r)_{j=0}^{\phi-1} \right)_{i=\alpha}^{t-1},$$

for the ϕ-sequences following the α^{th} ϕ-sequence. In consideration of all $\alpha \in [t]$ this collectively yields the polynomial

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^{t} \left(z^r \sum_{i=0}^{\alpha-2} \sum_{j=0}^{\phi-1} z^{i+j} + \sum_{i=\alpha}^{t-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\phi-1} z^{i+j} \right). \tag{14}$$

Finally, we must consider the α^{th} ϕ-sequence for each fixed $k = 1, 2, \ldots, s$. Here, the index $i = \alpha - 1$, whenever k lies in the corresponding interval $[(\alpha-1)\phi + 1, \alpha\phi]$. Since k is fixed, then $\ell = kr$ is also fixed, so the corresponding α^{th} ϕ-sequence looks like

$$(j + kr + \alpha - 1)_{j=0}^{\phi-1}.$$

If $\alpha = (\alpha-1)\phi + \beta$ for $\beta \in [\phi]$ then this ϕ-sequence is

$$(j + \alpha\phi + \beta - 1)_{j=0}^{\phi-1}.$$

So from the first $\beta - 1$ terms we must subtract $r(k-1)$ and from the last $z - \beta + 1$ terms we must subtract kr. Thus, this ϕ-sequence becomes

$$\left((j + r + \alpha - 1)_{j=0}^{\beta-2}, (j + \alpha - 1)_{j=\beta-1}^{\phi-1}\right).$$

In consideration of all $\alpha \in [t]$ and $\beta \in [\phi]$ this yields the polynomial

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^{t}\sum_{\beta=1}^{\phi}\left(z^{\alpha+r-1}\sum_{i=0}^{\beta-2} z^i + x^{\alpha-1}\sum_{i=\beta-1}^{\phi-1} z^i\right) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{t} z^{\alpha-1}\left(\sum_{i=0}^{\phi-1}(i+1)z^i + x^{r+\phi-1}\sum_{i=0}^{\phi-1}\left(\frac{1}{z}\right)^i\right). \tag{15}$$

Combining the results of equations (12), (13), (14), and (15), we see that $h^*(\Delta_{(1,q)}; z)$ is given by summing equations (16), (17), and (18) presented below. Equation (16) accounts for both equations (12) and (13).

$$1 + ((r-1)s)\sum_{\ell=1}^{r-1}\sum_{i=0}^{t-1}\sum_{j=0}^{\phi-1} z^{i+j+\ell}. \tag{16}$$

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^{t}\left(z^r\sum_{i=0}^{\alpha-2}\sum_{j=0}^{\phi-1} z^{i+j} + \sum_{i=\alpha}^{t-1}\sum_{j=0}^{\phi-1} z^{i+j}\right). \tag{17}$$

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^{t} z^{\alpha-1}\left(\sum_{i=0}^{\phi-1}(i+1)z^i + x^{r+\phi-1}\sum_{i=0}^{\phi-1}\left(\frac{1}{z}\right)^i\right). \tag{18}$$

Analogously, to the conclusion of Theorem 4.2 the sum of these three polynomials is unimodal. □

6. Future Directions

The results of this paper set the stage for a detailed investigation of Conjecture 1.3 in the special case of reflexive lattice simplices from a number theoretic perspective. As such, these results provide some obvious directions for future work in both discrete geometry and algebraic number theory as outlined by the following questions. We refer the reader to sections 2 and 3 for unfamiliar terminology used in these questions.

First, Remark 5.6 demonstrates that a q-vector satisfying Lemma 3.3 need not be h^*-unimodal. However, it is not clear in general what role Lemma 3.3 plays regarding h^*-unimodality and the structure of Hilbert bases for $\Delta_{(1,q)}$, leading to the following question.

Question 6.1. Suppose $r = (r_1, \ldots, r_k)$ supports a reflexive simplex $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ with q-vector satisfying Lemma 3.3. What constraints on the Hilbert basis of cone $\left(\Delta_{(1,q)}\right)$, if any, are implied by the linear system in Lemma 3.3? Further, for which divisibility patterns in the r-vector, if any, is Lemma 3.3 sufficient to imply h^*-unimodality for $\Delta_{(1,q)}$? Which families of q-vectors, if any, both satisfy Lemma 3.3 and fail to be h^*-unimodal?

Second, in sections 4 and 5, h^*-unimodality for some but not all of the examples studied follows from an *affine free sum* decomposition of the simplices. The affine free sum condition was used in [12] to produce reflexive simplices with non-unimodal h^*-polynomials, and in [4] to study the IDP condition for reflexive simplices. Given this, it is natural to ask when the free sum condition underlies the h^*-unimodality observed in the context of section 3.

Question 6.2. For each fixed dimension d, what fraction of reflexive IDP simplices of the form $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ arise via affine free sums?

Third, the reflexive simplices satisfying the necessary condition of Lemma 3.3 correspond to positive integral solutions to multivariate systems of algebraic equations. A full understanding of these simplices may require tools from algebraic geometry and algebraic number theory.

Question 6.3. What are the integral solutions to the multivariate system of algebraic equations arising from Lemma 3.3?

Fourth, as far as the authors know, in all published proofs that a family of polytopes is both IDP and h^*-unimodal, IDP and h^*-unimodality are established separately. Thus, the IDP has only been observed to correlate with h^*-unimodality; no proofs have shown a causal link between the two properties. For example, in well-known work of Bruns and Römer [6], the IDP condition is a consequence of the existence of a regular unimodular triangulation, while h^*-unimodality is established by using that triangulation to induce an application of the g-theorem. Thus, there is a need for proofs that demonstrate explicitly how the IDP condition might be used to prove h^*-unimodality directly. The following question is a step in this direction.

Question 6.4. Do there exist q-vectors for which h^*-unimodality of $\Delta_{(1,q)}$ can be established using only the conditions of Theorem 2.6?

As a final remark, the results of this paper offer new avenues by which to search for counterexamples to Conjecture 1.3. In the special case of the simplices $\Delta_{(1,q)}$, the expression of the h^*-polynomial arising from Theorem 2.5 provides a direct link between the structure of a q-vector and the behavior of the associated h^*-polynomial. A deeper study of general polynomials of the form given in Theorem 2.5 might provide insight leading to a counterexample, if one exists. Another possible direction in which to search for counterexamples is suggested by Question 6.1, through the identification of broad families of q-vectors that simultaneously satisfy Lemma 3.3 and fail to be h^*-unimodal. Even if a counterexample is found to the general conjecture, improved explanations of the broadly-observed h^*-unimodality for reflexive polytopes, including in the special case of $\Delta_{(1,q)}$, is needed.

References

[1] Matthias Beck, Pallavi Jayawant, and Tyrrell B. McAllister. Lattice-point generating functions for free sums of convex sets. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 120(6):1246–1262, 2013.

[2] Matthias Beck and Sinai Robins. *Computing the continuous discretely*. Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer, New York, second edition, 2015. Integer-point enumeration in polyhedra, With illustrations by David Austin.

[3] Benjamin Braun. *Unimodality problems in Ehrhart theory*, pages 687–711. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2016.

[4] Benjamin Braun and Robert Davis. Ehrhart series, unimodality, and integrally closed reflexive polytopes. to appear.

[5] Francesco Brenti. Log-concave and unimodal sequences in algebra, combinatorics, and geometry: an update. In *Jerusalem combinatorics '93*, volume 178 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 71–89. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1994.

[6] Winfried Bruns and Tim Römer. h-vectors of Gorenstein polytopes. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 114(1):65–76, 2007.

[7] Heinke Conrads. Weighted projective spaces and reflexive simplices. *Manuscripta Math.*, 107(2):215–227, 2002.

[8] Eugène Ehrhart. Sur les polyèdres rationnels homothétiques à n dimensions. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 254:616–618, 1962.

[9] Takayuki Hibi. Flawless O-sequences and Hilbert functions of Cohen-Macaulay integral domains. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 60(3):245–251, 1989.

[10] Takayuki Hibi. Dual polytopes of rational convex polytopes. *Combinatorica*, 12(2):237–240, 1992.

[11] Hidefumi Ohsugi and Takayuki Hibi. Special simplices and Gorenstein toric rings. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 113(4):718–725, 2006.

[12] Sam Payne. Ehrhart series and lattice triangulations. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 40(3):365–376, 2008.

[13] Richard P. Stanley. Decompositions of rational convex polytopes. *Ann. Discrete Math.*, 6:333–342, 1980. Combinatorial mathematics, optimal designs and their applications (Proc. Sympos. Combin. Math. and Optimal Design, Colorado State Univ., Fort Collins, Colo., 1978).

[14] Richard P. Stanley. Log-concave and unimodal sequences in algebra, combinatorics, and geometry. In *Graph theory and its applications: East and West (Jinan, 1986)*, volume 576 of *Ann. New York Acad. Sci.*, pages 500–535. New York Acad. Sci., New York, 1989.

Department of Mathematics, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506–0027
E-mail address: benjamin.braun@uky.edu

Department of Mathematics, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824
E-mail address: davisr@math.msu.edu

IST Austria, Klosterneuburg, Austria, and, Institute for Data, Systems, and Society, MIT, Cambridge, MA, USA
E-mail address: liam.solus@ist.ac.at and lsolus@mit.edu